UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United	States of America,)	Case No. CR 15 - Mj - 70450	
	Plaintiff, v.)))	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT	
	e) LEON 61 Defendant.)		
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on how 2015 the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from April 15 , 2015 to May 14 , 2015 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):				
	Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).			
	defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to exp	prosecu pect ade	to [check applicable reasons] the number of ation, or the existence of novel questions of fact equate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).	
			the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, gence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).				
X IT IS	Time is ALSO EXCLUSO ORDERED.	040	unoue Ted. R. Cein Proc. 5.1	
DATE	سر ا سر اران			
STIPU	JLATED: Attorney for Defendant		United States Magistrate Judge Assistant United States Attorney	